



Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Ted Stewart
Executive Director
James W. Carter
Division Director

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

May 24, 1994

TO: Minerals File

FROM: Tony Gallegos, Reclamation Engineer *aa*

RE: Site Inspection, John Fausett, Cedar Buttes Mine, S/047/028, Uintah County, Utah

Date of Inspection: May 20, 1994
Time of Inspection: 9:15 - 10:20
Conditions: Clear skies, cool breeze from the South
Participants: Robert Fausett, representing John Fausett; Leon Fillingham, Duchesne County; and Tony Gallegos, DOGM

Purpose of Inspection: To evaluate the status of this site and verify the small mining status

It seems that Mr. John Fausett has recently died; Robert Fausett will be the new contact for the site, in addition to Leon, who represents Duchesne County. It seems Duchesne County has entered into an agreement with Fausetts. Duchesne County is now 25% owner of the Cedar Buttes pit. The contract calls for a certain amount of tonnage to be allotted to the county. The county is the actual entity doing the work at the site; sort of like a subcontractor.

I supplied Leon and Robert with copies of the Minerals Rules and also a copies of the Large Mining Operations Notice of Intent. We had a brief discussion describing the permitting issues in going from a small mine operation to a large mine operation. I informed them that the permit requirements were more detailed than a small mine and a bond was also required. I informed them that it would probably take the Division 60 days to review a large mine application that was submitted and there would probably be some additional time due to ironing out any outstanding concerns. I described the bonding situation, in that the Division would require a reclamation bond for the site if it were a large mine. The reclamation bond is based on third party costs and escalated for five years into the future; so the mine plan, in a sense, should cover five years. The reclamation estimate is based on site specifics and obviously, the operator could probably reclaim the site for less than the bond. I informed them that the large mine application should be submitted well in advance of going to a large mine. It could take several months for the Division to process the application. I mentioned that I had previously requested a map or sketch of this area from John. Robert agreed to check the files to see if anything had been prepared. Otherwise, Leon mentioned that Duchesne County could perform a quick survey of this site and generate a map of the various areas. I informed them that if the site was slightly over five acres, the Division would probably try to negotiate some reclamation of the site, that is, reclamation of areas that they didn't need to use in order to keep them under a small mine status. However, if they intended to go to a large mine status, then we would require the permit and the bond.



Page 2
Site Inspection
Cedar Buttes Mine
S/047/028
May 24, 1994

We traveled to the main pit area next. The excavation seemed to have deepened some since my last inspection; otherwise, the site appears to be basically unchanged. There is currently a catch bench about 20 feet wide, approximately 20-30 feet above the current pit floor. The MSHA people required this catch bench. MSHA would prefer a catch bench every 60 vertical feet. However, this highwall had been constructed beyond 60 vertical feet before MSHA had requested it. The north border of the pit is up against Forest Service property. Leon and Robert informed me that the Forest Service had visited this site several times this year and was possibly looking into opening an asphalt pit immediately adjacent to Fausett's pit. We discussed the possible permitting issues for that type of situation. The permitting issues would be a large mine filed by Fausetts, which included Forest Service land, or an adjacent small mine plan filed by the Forest Service. It would depend on who was going to actually do the mining, etc. I suggested if the Forest Service was seriously considering it, that we plan a joint meeting between the Forest Service, the operators and the Division. They mentioned they would contact the Forest Service and if it did look like they were interested, we would try to schedule a meeting sometime after the next two weeks.

The overburden type material south and adjacent to the existing pit, is the salvaged topsoil material. That material would be used at the time of final reclamation. There is currently a large stockpile of asphalt at the site. The asphalt is hauled from the pit to a crusher station at the same level as the pit. The asphalt is then removed from the level at the bottom of the stockpile.

A visual estimate of the site disturbance would be close to five acres now. Mr. Fillingham from Duchesne County, thought they were close to five acres now.

It's possible that if the Forest Service does enter into an agreement with the Fausetts, this would become a large mine operation and the highwall would be moved back. If that was the case, Duchesne County would salvage all the topsoil overburden and stockpile it south of the main pit on one of the existing pads. They would then construct a bench every 60 vertical feet in the new pit, as requested by MSHA. That possibility may be years down the road.

Photos were taken to document the current status of this site.

jb
cc: Robert Fausett, Operator
Leon Fillingham, Duchesne County
S047028.ins



